

III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22 and 24 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5 and 13 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Brandow *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,041), hereafter “Brandow,” in view of Reshef *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,569), hereafter “Reshef,” and further in view of Wagner (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,224), hereafter “Wagner.”

Applicants assert that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 5 and 13, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the message that is intercepted, examined and about while a determination is made is contains the information for constructing the query that includes an entirety of a string of text based information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein. In contrast, none of the references cited by the Office teach or suggest entry of a text string by a user that is then incorporated in its entirety into a query. The cited references also do not teach or suggest that a message bearing this information is intercepted prior to execution of the query, examined, and a determination made regarding the propriety of the message based on the entered information. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.


With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 31, 2007

Hunter E. Webb

Rcg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew